

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO DEN 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/494,211	01/25/2000	Il-Ki Woo	003364.P035	3154
7:	590 07/09/2003			
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP 12400 Wilshire Boulevard 7th Floor			EXAMINER	
			DOVE, TRACY MAE	
Los Angeles, CA 90025			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1745 DATE MAILED: 07/09/2003	19

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Ĺ	
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/494,211	WOO ET AL.	
, in the second	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tracy Dove	1745	
Th MAILING DATE of this communication app	ars on the cover she t with the	corr spond nce addre	ess
THE REPLY FILED 20 June 2003 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to aviginal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	roid abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment whic I (with appeal fee); or (3) a time	ation. A proper reply h places the applicati	to a on in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	•	
 a) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). 	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejection	ղ.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officitimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The appro originally set in the final C	priate extension office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	·		,
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or sim	plifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ing a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed a	mendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		idered but does NOT	place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	•	•	•
Claim(s) allowed: 26-28 and 31.	•		
Claim(s) objected to: <u>6-18 and 21-25</u> .			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-5,19,20,29 and 30</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	proved by the Examin	er.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme			
10.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>	.,,	•	
10.84 Calot. See Communication Greek		ly ick Ryan Patent Examiner ly Center 1700	·

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The added limitation "produced by a plating process into a foil shape" would require further search and/or consideration.

Continuation of 10. Other: The declaration is insufficient to provide evidence of unexpected results because it does not compare the claimed invention with the prior art of record. Furthermore, evidence of unexpected results cannot be used to overcome a 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection. Applicant argues (regarding the Idota reference) that Examiner's motivation that copper alloys are particularly preferred is based on the Examiner's personal knowledge. Applicant requested the Examiner file a declaration in support. However, a declaration is not necessary because the Examiner's motivation that copper alloys are particularly preferred is disclosed by the Idota reference, see col. 16, lines 25-26.